

REMARKS

Applicants request favorable reconsideration and allowance of this application in view of the foregoing amendments and the following remarks.

Claims 1, 4, 5, 8-12, 15, 16, and 19-30 are pending in the present application. Claims 1, 12, 23, 24, 25, 26, 27, 28, 29, and 30 are the independent claims.

Claims 2, 3, 6, 7, 13, 14, 17, and 18 have been cancelled without prejudice. Claims 1, 4, 5, 8-10, 12, 15, 16, 19-21, 23, and 24 have been amended and Claims 25-30 have been added. Support for these amendments and new claims can be found in the original specification, and therefore no new matter has been added.

Claims 5 and 16 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention. Applicants have amended those claims in view of the Examiner's comments and believe that such amendments overcome the Examiner's objections. Favorable reconsideration and withdrawal of this rejection are requested.

Claims 1-7, 10, 12-18, 21, 23 and 24 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 6,266,442 B1 (Laumeyer et al.). Applicants respectfully traverse this rejection for the reasons below.

As recited in Claims 1 and 12, the present invention includes, *inter alia*, the features of extracting frame data whose position data matches or nearly matches from plural pieces of frame data and deleting extracted frame data overlapping another piece of frame data. As recited in Claims 25 and 26 (respectively corresponding to prior dependent Claims 7 and 8 rewritten in independent form), the present invention includes, among others, the features of extracting frame data determined, by comparing two pieces of frame data, to have been captured at the same position and deleting extracted frame data overlapping another piece of frame data. Claims 23, 24, and 29 recite features similar to

Claim 1 and Claims 27 and 28 recite features similar to Claim 26, and Claim 30 recites features similar to Claim 25. Applicants submit that the cited art fails to disclose or suggest at least the above-mentioned features.

Laumeyre discloses obtaining frame data by using a system as shown in Fig. 3B, and discriminating an object such as road signs in the image. That patent relates to discriminating a particular object from an image, but it fails to disclose or suggest deleting frame data whose position data nearly matches or frame data captured at the same position.

The other cited art fails to add anything to remedy the deficiencies of Laumeyre.

Accordingly, Applicants submit that the independent claims are patentable over the cited art. The dependent claims are also patentable for at least the same reasons as the respective independent claims, as well as for the additional features they recite.

For the foregoing reasons, Applicants submit that this application is in condition for allowance. Favorable reconsideration, withdrawal of the rejections set forth in the above-mentioned Office Action, and an early Notice of Allowance are requested.

Applicants' undersigned attorney may be reached in our Washington, D.C. office by telephone at (202) 530-1010. All correspondence should be directed to our below-listed address.

Respectfully submitted,

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read 'B. L. Klock', written over a horizontal line.

Attorney for Applicants

Brian L. Klock

Registration No. 36,570

FITZPATRICK, CELLA, HARPER & SCINTO
30 Rockefeller Plaza
New York, New York 10112-3801
Facsimile: (212) 218-2200

BLK/lmj

DC_MAIN 159782v1